

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 are now pending in the application including new Claims 10-17. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the restriction requirement in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Claims 5-9 have been amended herein in order to place these Claims in U.S. claim format and to better place these claims in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amended claims prior to examination of the present application.

### **SPECIFICATION**

Applicant has amended the specification to correct discrepancies between certain part numbers identified in the specification and the drawings. Amended Paragraphs [0022] and [0027] are provided herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter amended paragraphs [0022] and [0027] in the specification prior to examination of the present application.

### **RESTRICTIONS/ELECTIONS**

Applicant notes per a telephone conversation between the Examiner and Applicant's representative, Thomas Krul on August 5, 2004, Applicant identified discrepancies between the definition of species I and II and the corresponding Figures as provided in the office action mailed June 10, 2004. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative. Based on this conversation, the Examiner agreed that the distinction between species I and II identified in the office action

should be amended. Species I should reflect the embodiment of Figures 1-7 and species II should reflect the embodiment of Figures 8-11. The Examiner noted election of a single species for prosecution on the merits is required under 35 U.S.C. §121. Per the Examiner, the application contains claims directed to two patentably distinct species of the claimed invention as amended above.

Applicant provisionally elects species II (as amended above) directed to Figures 8-11, with traverse. Claims 5-9 as well as new Claims 10-17 read on this species.


The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider her restriction requirement with respect to the present application because it is believed that it would not produce a serious burden upon the Examiner to maintain species I of Figures 1-7 together with the provisionally elected species II, because the embodiments of the present invention share a significant number of common features which should permit a common search encompassing the same class(es). (See MPEP §803.)

CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 5, 2004

By:   
Thomas J. Krul  
Reg. No. 46,842

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MLF/TJK/mmk